REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 10, 11 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,600,789), hereinafter *Parker*. Claims 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cordero et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0044339), hereinafter *Cordero*, in view of *Parker*. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Parker* in view *Cordero*. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Parker* in view of Bailey(U.S. Pat. No. 6,981,180), hereinafter *Bailey*.[1]

By this no claims have been amended, cancelled, or added. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 10-11 and 14-23 are pending, of which claims 1, 14, 21 and 22 are the only independent claims at issue.

As noted previously, the application is generally directed to allowing for efficient testing of different interfaces intended to be used with an application program. In claims 1 and 21 this is accomplished by identifying an application program interface (API) that is common to each of the interfaces and performing testing on the common API as a representative test for all of the interfaces. A representation of a first value is provided, through a test program, to the application program through the common API. If an expected result is returned, a determination can be made that all of the different interfaces are interoperable with the application program. Claim 1 further recites that another common API is identified and that the test program written for the first API is recompiled to function with the another common API. Claim 21 further recites that another common API is identified and that an API call for the first API is converted to a call for the second API.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

With regards to claim 1 and 21, the Office Action admits that Parker does not teach "converting the test program, by recompiling source code of the test program to function with at least one of the one or more other application program interfaces, such that the test program is configured to access the identified application program through at least one of the one or more other application program interfaces" and instead relies on Official Notice. Applicant disagrees

[1] Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

with the Examiner's rationale and specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

With regards to claims 14 and 22, the Office Action states regarding Cordero that "although integration testing is not provided in fine detail, the Examiner argues that it is an inherent matter to test the cross-platform core by sending a test value to each of the different platforms that is integrated to work with the core." Thus the Office Action has assumed how the testing might be performed in Cordero without any such evidence of how that testing was actually performed. However, even if it is assumed that Cordero taught the testing claimed in the Office Action (which it does not), Cordero still fails to teach the recited elements of the claims. These claims do not merely recite sending a test value to each of the different platforms, but rather recite "sending a first value to the application program for each of the plurality of identified interfaces," "receiving a plurality of results", where each result corresponds to an interface, and comparing the results to identify an expected result. Simply testing different platforms does not accomplish this result. In particular, sending any test value for each interface is not the same as sending the same first value to the application program for each of the plurality of identified interfaces. There is no evidence in Cordero of any testing, let alone evidence that the same value is sent to different interfaces. If different values are sent, then the comparison act recited by the claims would not yield the same result as what is achieved by the claims when the first value is sent to the application program for each of the plurality of identified interfaces.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 16th day of December, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/J. LAVAR OLDHAM/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
J. LAVAR OLDHAM
Registration No. 53,409
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:JLO:cj
2122245_1.DOC